

**JOINT DEVELOPMENT CONTROL COMMITTEE - CAMBRIDGE FRINGES**

20 November 2019

10.00 am - 1.00 pm

**Present:** Councillors Baigent, Page-Croft, Sargeant (Vice-Chair), Thornburrow, Tunnacliffe, Ashwood, Bradnam, Harford, Richards, Bygott, de Lacey (Chair), Williams and Price

**Officers Present:**

Assistant Director Delivery, Cambridge City and South Cambridgeshire District Councils: Sharon Brown

Principal Planner (Strategic Sites): Philippa Kelly

Senior Planner (Development Management) – City: Aaron Coe

Delivery Manager (Strategic): Chris Carter

Principal Urban Designer: Jon Brookes

Legal Adviser: Keith Barber

Committee Manager: Toni Birkin

**Other Officers Present:**

10-19 Area Education Officer: Rob Lewis

Transport Assessment Manager: David Allatt

Transport Officer: Jez Tuttle

<b>FOR THE INFORMATION OF THE COUNCIL</b>
---

**19/46/JDCC      Apologies**

Apologies were received from City Councillor Smart (Councillor Price was present as alternate), South Cambs DC Councillor Chamberlain and South Cambs DC Councillor Hunt

**19/47/JDCC      Declarations of Interest**

Councillor	Item	Interest
Councillor Baigent	19/50/JDCC and 19/51/JDCC	Personal: Member Cambridge Cycling Campaign
Councillor Thornburrow	19/50/JDCC and	Personal: Ward Councillor for the area

	19/51/JDCC	
Councillor Ashwood	19/50/JDCC and 19/51/JDCC	Personal: Ward Councillor for the area

## **19/48/JDCC      Minutes**

The minutes of the meeting of the 23<sup>rd</sup> October 2019 were agreed and signed as a correct record subject to minor corrections to the text (Question 24 to read: Suggested that the Market Square needed an alternative name to avoid confusion with Cambridge Market Square).

**Vice-Chair Councillor Sargeant took the Chair as only City and County Councillors could vote on the following application**

## **19/49/JDCC      Planning Application 19/1134/FUL - 9 Whitelocks Drive**

The Committee received an application for full planning permission for a single storey side and rear extension.

The Committee noted that proposed chimney feature (8.6 of the Officer's report) had been withdrawn from the application and thus should be disregarded in the Committee's determination.

The Committee received a representation in objection to the application from a local resident.

The representation covered the following issues:

- i. Objected to (a) the impact (and possible precedent an approval might create) on the public realm of the proposed garden infill and (b) the increased height of the garden fence.
- ii. Current building line is set back from the site boundary and allows sight lines across open areas for other residents.
- iii. Open views would be lost/restricted by the increased fence height.
- iv. Scale and massing of the proposal was out of keeping with the area.
- v. Proposal was out of keeping with the character of the area.
- vi. Development would harm the street scene.
- vii. Suggested that the fence height should not exceed 1.8m, the garden should be protected and any extension to match the materials of the original build.
- viii. Some form of control is appropriate which would prevent the loss of more than 50% of the original garden

Mark Richards (Applicant's Agent) addressed the Committee in support of the application.

The Committee made the following comments in response to the Officer's report.

- i. Sought clarification regarding the position and orientation of the plot.
- ii. Suggested that the illustrations were confusing and thus difficult to interpret.

Councillor Tunnacliffe proposed a deferral of this application to allow the Officer's to prepare more detailed illustrations. There was no seconder and therefore the proposal was lost.

In response to Members' questions the Senior Planning Officer stated the following:

- i. Confirmed that a matching materials condition had been included – proposed condition 4.
- ii. All future applications for extensions or changes would each be considered on its own merits.

It response to Members request for some assurance about the fence height, the Assistant Director stated that it was Officers' opinion that it was irrelevant whether the height of this fence was 2.1 or 2.5 metres. Due to the location of this boundary treatment the difference of 40cm in height for a boundary treatment that is only 7 metres wide would not result in any additional harm. This view was supported by the City Council Urban Design team.

The Committee:

**Resolved (by 9 votes to 0)** to grant the application for planning permission in accordance with the Officer recommendation, for the reasons set out in the Officer's report subject to the conditions recommended in the Officer's report.

**Councillor de Lacey Chaired the consideration of the remaining agenda items**

**19/50/JDCC      18/0181/OUT - Land North Of Cherry Hinton, Coldhams Lane (Education)**

The Principal Planner gave an introductory overview of the development of Land North of Cherry Hinton. She provided a summary of the planning policy

context and details of the Outline Planning application, including timeline since submission in March 2018.

Rob Lewis (10-19 Area Education Officer) gave a post submission presentation regarding Land North of Cherry Hinton, Coldham's Lane (Education).

In response to Members' questions the Area Education Officer said the following:

- i. Confirmed that the Primary School would have a phased entry system as it was intended to serve the new development and would grow with the community. However, it was acknowledged that parents had statutory choices regarding their preferred school.
- ii. Confirmed that there were plans to expand other schools in the area such as St Phillips in Romsey.
- iii. Stated that a wider piece of work was on-going regarding sixth form provision which would be looking at provision across the City and beyond (Ely).
- iv. Provision of vocation training would be included in the wider provision review.
- v. Confirmed that generous outdoor space for the schools had been included which would also allow for revision to the building footprint within the site.
- vi. Confirmed that the developer contribution would only part fund the Secondary school as a significant proportion of the provision was required to meet an existing short fall in provision.
- vii. Shared members concerns that the primary school, as the heart of the new community, might not be completed in line with the built out of housing.
- viii. Confirmed that the Primary school would be a Wave 12 Free School ESFA (Education Skills Funding Agency). The curriculum would meet national standards with little direct local influence.
- ix. Confirmed that the entry process would be managed to minimise any impact of other schools in the area.

**19/51/JDCC      18/0181/OUT - Land North of Cherry Hinton, Coldhams Lane (Transport)**

### **Post Submission Presentation**

The Transport Assessment Manager gave a post submission presentation regarding Land North of Cherry Hinton, Coldham's Lane (Transport).

The Transport Assessment Manager outlined the policy requirements and the sustainability approach taken towards the proposed mitigation measures. He presented a brief overview of the strategic vision of the Greater Cambridge Partnership (GCP) for sustainable travel in the area with less reliance on the car and long term alternative travel modes.

A forward looking site assessment had been completed considering the impact on existing junctions and interaction with existing road users and pedestrians.

The Chair invited local Ward Councillor for Teversham, Councillor Daunton to address the Committee.

Councillor Daunton was concerned that Teversham village appeared to have been omitted from the North of Cherry Hinton plans. It currently had a number of development sites in close proximity to the village but had received little or no extra provision.

The Transport Assessment Manager explained that mitigation must be limited to areas directly impacted by the proposed development. However, there was recognition of the need to connect new communities to exiting villages. The Transport Officer added that Teversham transport link would enjoy some improvements to cycle and pedestrian routes as a result of the Wing (Marley) development.

Members expressed concerns regarding the following:

- i. The Sixth form college had a high proportion of its catchment area outside the proposed development site. This would result in significant additional traffic in the area. Airport Way lacked the capacity to deal with the envisaged number of additional vehicles generated.
- ii. Suggested that the proposed bus route would not be popular with bus users and was not logical.
- iii. Suggested that the transport strategy did not give rail use significant attention.
- iv. Expressed the hope that pedestrian routes around and between villages would be protected as this promoted the health and wellbeing of residents.
- v. Suggested that car parking areas should be grouped together within new developments so that the land could be redeveloped for an alternative purpose/use when car use was significantly reduced.

In response to Members' questions the Transport Assessment Manager and the Transport Officer said the following:

- i. Confirmed that school traffic had been included in the transport assessments undertaken. However, mitigation measures were controlled by the application of the statutory tests within CIL Regulations. Increased traffic generated from meeting an existing school need could not be included.
- ii. Stated that the highway authority were aware of proposed additional supermarket provision in the Newmarket Road area and the impact it would have on traffic. Congestion was a result of the success of the City and the highway authority's teams were working to secure the best outcomes with the tools available to them.
- iii. Suggested that the proposed development could not wait for the delivery of the long term goals of the GCP for alternative traffic modes.
- iv. Agreed that cycle routes in the Coldham's Lane area were currently problematic due to the railway bridges and stated that they were looking at alternative routes that would be attractive to cyclists.
- v. Suggested that land in the area was limited, making it difficult to separate cyclists from pedestrians removing the conflict. It was acknowledge the increased use of electric cycles would exacerbated the problem.
- vi. Agreed that improvements to 'The Tins' cycle path would be beneficial but stated that that was too large an infrastructure project to be seen as a mitigation for this proposed development.
- vii. Confirmed that a lot of thought had gone into the route of the main spine road through the development and measures, such as 20 mph speed limits would be used to make it unattractive as a rat-run.
- viii. Stated that as there was no current commitment to a railway station in Cherry Hinton, which meant no financial contribution could be secured against this.
- ix. Stated that the bus route had not been finalised but in the long-term, any bus route would need to generate significant users to cover its costs.

The meeting ended at 1.00 pm

**CHAIR**